



## ***Texas Department of Insurance***

### ***Division of Workers' Compensation***

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645

512-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • [www.tdi.texas.gov](http://www.tdi.texas.gov)

## ***MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION***

### ***GENERAL INFORMATION***

#### **Requestor Name and Address**

MEMORIAL HERMANN HOSPITAL SYSTEM  
3200 SW FREEWAY SUITE 2200  
HOUSTON TX 77027

#### **Respondent Name**

AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE CO

#### **Carrier's Austin Representative Box**

Box Number 19

#### **MFDR Date Received**

OCTOBER 26, 2007

#### **MFDR Tracking Number**

M4-08-1284-01

### ***REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY***

**Requestor's Position Summary dated October 24, 2007:** "This patient was emergently admitted to Memorial Hermann Hospital under the care of Dr. Alan Rechter due to a severe crush injury to his foot where he underwent surgical repair. Subsequently, the patient developed gangrene in the wound site and had to be re-admitted to amputate part of his foot. The first admission was due to an emergency trauma and pre-authorization was not necessary. The second admission was pre-authorized by the carrier." "The amounts paid by the carrier on both admissions were insufficient." "Requestor submits that a fair and reasonable rate for treatment of this injured employee is the usual and customary charges incurred. Requestor is owed an additional \$30,784.00, plus interest on the first admission." "On the second admission which was approved by the carrier, the amount paid by the carrier falls far below the expected reimbursement rate under the Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline (ACIHFG) found in Commission Rule 134.401. Memorial Hermann Hospital's usual and customary charges exceeded the stop loss reimbursement level contained in the ACIHFG and should have been reimbursed at 75% of the total billed charges." "The complications from this injury and infection caused this injured employee to receive extensive services and supplies. The nature of the patient's extensive injury and post operative care required the patient to incur unusually costly services and medical supplies during his stay." "In this case, the hospital's usual and customary charges for room and board, ancillary services and drug charges amounted to \$81,404.50, and exceeded the stop loss threshold found in the Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline, Rule 134.401(c)(6)." "Because the hospital's usual and customary charges exceeded the stop loss threshold, payment should have been made at 75% of total charges."

**Amount in Dispute:** \$78,421.38

### ***RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY***

**Respondent's Position Summary:** "This is a medical fee dispute arising from an inpatient hospital surgical admission, dates of service 10/26/2006 to 11/21/2006. Requestor billed a total of \$118,896.50. the Requestor asserts it is entitled to reimbursement in the amount of \$20,124.00, which is 75% of the total charges. Requestor has not shown entitlement to this alternative, exceptional method of calculating reimbursement and has not otherwise properly calculated the audited charges."

**Response Submitted by:** Ronald M. Johnson, Flahive, Ogden & Latson, 504 Lavaca, Suite 1000, Austin, TX 78701

## **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

Date(s) of Service	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
October 26, 2006 through November 1, 2006	Inpatient Services – Trauma Admit	\$30,784.00	\$0.00
November 9, 2006 through November 21, 2006	Inpatient Services – Surgical Admit	\$47,637.38	\$0.00
TOTAL		\$78,421.38	\$0.00

## **FINDINGS AND DECISION**

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

### **Background**

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307 sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, 22 *Texas Register* 6264, effective August 1, 1997, sets out the fee guidelines for inpatient services rendered in an acute care hospital.
3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, 31 *Texas Register* 3561, effective May 2, 2006, sets out the guidelines for a fair and reasonable amount of reimbursement in the absence of a contract or an applicable division fee guideline."
4. Texas Labor Code §413.011 sets forth provisions regarding reimbursement policies and guidelines.
5. The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:
  - 42-Charges exceed our fee schedule or maximum allowable amount.
  - 16-Claim/service lacks information which is needed for adjudication. Additional information is supplied using remittance advice remarks codes whenever appropriate.
  - W1-Workers Compensation state fee schedule adjustment.
  - Z656-Any request for reconsideration of this workers' compensation payment should be accompanied by a copy of this explanation of review.

### **Findings for Inpatient Admission dated October 26, 2006 through November 1, 2006:**

1. This dispute relates to inpatient surgical services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of former 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(5)(A), which requires that when "Trauma (ICD-9 codes 800.0-959.50)" diagnosis codes are listed as the primary diagnosis, reimbursement for the entire admission shall be at a fair and reasonable rate. Review of box 67 on the hospital bill finds that the principle diagnosis code is listed as 928.20. The Division therefore determines that this inpatient admission shall be reimbursed at a fair and reasonable rate pursuant to Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1 and Texas Labor Code §413.011(d).
2. Texas Administrative Code §134.1, effective May 2, 2006, 31 *Texas Register* 3561, requires that, in the absence of an applicable fee guideline, reimbursement for health care not provided through a workers' compensation health care network shall be made in accordance with subsection §134.1(d) which states that "Fair and reasonable reimbursement: (1) is consistent with the criteria of Labor Code §413.011; (2) ensures that similar procedures provided in similar circumstances receive similar reimbursement; and (3) is based on nationally recognized published studies, published Division medical dispute decisions, and values assigned for services involving similar work and resource commitments, if available."
3. Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual's behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in establishing the fee guidelines.
4. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(c)(2)(G), effective December 31, 2006, 31 *Texas Register* 10314, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, requires the requestor to provide "documentation

that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement in accordance with §134.1 of this title (relating to Medical Reimbursement) when the dispute involves health care for which the Division has not established a maximum allowable reimbursement (MAR), as applicable.” Review of the submitted documentation finds that:

- The requestor’s position statement asserts that “Requestor submits that a fair and reasonable rate for treatment of this injured employee is the usual and customary charges incurred. Requestor is owed an additional \$30,784.00, plus interest for the first admission.”
- The requestor does not discuss or explain how full reimbursement of billed charges would result in a fair and reasonable reimbursement.
- The requestor did not provide documentation to demonstrate how it determined its usual and customary charges for the disputed services.
- The requestor did not submit documentation to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement.
- The Division has previously found that a reimbursement methodology based upon payment of a hospital’s billed charges, or a percentage of billed charges, does not produce an acceptable payment amount. This methodology was considered and rejected by the Division in the *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline* adoption preamble which states at 22 Texas Register 6276 (July 4, 1997) that:

“A discount from billed charges was another method of reimbursement which was considered. Again, this method was found unacceptable because it leaves the ultimate reimbursement in the control of the hospital, thus defeating the statutory objective of effective cost control and the statutory standard not to pay more than for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living. It also provides no incentive to contain medical costs, would be administratively burdensome for the Commission and system participants, and would require additional Commission resources.
- The requestor did not submit nationally recognized published studies or documentation of values assigned for services involving similar work and resource commitments to support the requested reimbursement.
- The requestor did not support that payment of the requested amount would satisfy the requirements of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1.

The request for additional reimbursement is not supported. Thorough review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not demonstrated or justified that payment of the amount sought would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute. Additional payment cannot be recommended.

#### **Findings for Inpatient Admission dated November 9, 2006 through November 21, 2006:**

This dispute relates to inpatient surgical services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, titled *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, effective August 1, 1997, 22 Texas Register 6264. The Third Court of Appeals’ November 13, 2008 opinion in *Texas Mutual Insurance Company v. Vista Community Medical Center, LLP*, 275 South Western Reporter Third 538, 550 (Texas Appeals – Austin 2008, petition denied) addressed a challenge to the interpretation of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401. The Court concluded that “to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved unusually costly and unusually extensive services.” Both the requestor and respondent in this case were notified via form letter that the mandate for the decision cited above was issued on January 19, 2011. Each was given the opportunity to supplement their original MDR submission, position or response as applicable. The documentation filed by the requestor and respondent to date will be considered in determining whether the admission in dispute is eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss method of payment. Consistent with the Third Court of Appeals’ November 13, 2008 opinion, the division will address whether the total audited charges **in this case** exceed \$40,000; whether the admission and disputed services **in this case** are unusually extensive; and whether the admission and disputed services **in this case** are unusually costly. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C) states, in pertinent part, that “Independent reimbursement is allowed on a case-by-case basis if the particular case exceeds the stop-loss threshold as described in paragraph (6) of this subsection...” 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) puts forth the requirements to meet the three factors that will be discussed.

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6)(A)(i) states “...to be eligible for stop-loss payment the total audited charges for a hospital admission must exceed \$40,000, the minimum stop-loss threshold.” Furthermore, (A) (v) of that same section states “...Audited charges are those charges which remain after a bill

review by the insurance carrier has been performed...” Review of the explanation of benefits issued by the carrier finds that the carrier did not deduct any charges in accordance with §134.401(c)(6)(A)(v); therefore the audited charges equal \$81,404.50. The Division concludes that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000.

2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C) allows for payment under the stop-loss exception on a case-by-case basis only if the particular case exceeds the stop-loss threshold as described in paragraph (6). Paragraph (6)(A)(ii) states that “This stop-loss threshold is established to ensure compensation for unusually extensive services required during an admission.” The Third Court of Appeals’ November 13, 2008 opinion states that “to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved unusually costly and unusually extensive services” and further states that “...independent reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception was meant to apply on a case-by-case basis in relatively few cases.” The requestor in its original position statement states that “The complications from this injury and infection caused this injured employee to receive extensive services and supplies. The nature of the patient’s extensive injury and post operative care required the patient to incur unusually costly services and medical supplies during his stay.” “In this case, the hospital’s usual and customary charges for room and board, ancillary services and drug charges amounted to \$81,404.50, and exceeded the stop loss threshold found in the Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline, Rule 134.401(c)(6).” “Because the hospital’s usual and customary charges exceeded the stop loss threshold, payment should have been made at 75% of total charges.” This position does not meet the requirements of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C) because the requestor presumes that the disputed services meet Stop-Loss, thereby presuming that the admission was unusually extensive. The division concludes that the requestor failed to meet the requirements of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C).
3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) states that “Stop-loss is an independent reimbursement methodology established to ensure fair and reasonable compensation to the hospital for unusually costly services rendered during treatment to an injured worker.” The Third Court of Appeals’ November 13, 2008 opinion concluded that in order to be eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss exception, a hospital must demonstrate that an admission involved unusually costly services. Neither the requestor’s position statements, nor the affidavits provided demonstrate how this inpatient admission was unusually costly. The requestor does not provide a reasonable comparison between the cost associated with this admission when compared to similar surgical services or admissions, thereby failing to demonstrate that the admission in dispute was unusually costly. The division concludes that the requestor failed to meet the requirements of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6).
4. For the reasons stated above the services in dispute are not eligible for the stop-loss method of reimbursement. Consequently, reimbursement shall be calculated pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1) titled *Standard Per Diem Amount* and §134.401(c)(4) titled *Additional Reimbursements*. The Division notes that additional reimbursements under §134.401(c)(4) apply only to bills that do not reach the stop-loss threshold described in subsection (c)(6) of this section.
  - Review of the submitted documentation finds that the services provided were surgical; therefore the standard per diem amount of \$1,118.00 per day applies. Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(3)(ii) states, in pertinent part, that “The applicable Workers’ Compensation Standard Per Diem Amount (SPDA) is multiplied by the length of stay (LOS) for admission...” The length of stay was twelve days. The surgical per diem rate of \$1,118.00 multiplied by the length of stay of twelve days results in an allowable amount of \$13,416.00.
  - 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(4)(C) states “Pharmaceuticals administered during the admission and greater than \$250 charged per dose shall be reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10%. Dose is the amount of a drug or other substance to be administered at one time.” A review of the submitted itemized statement finds that the requestor billed \$551.00/unit for Sevoflurane. The requestor did not submit documentation to support what the cost to the hospital was for these items billed under revenue code 250. For that reason, additional reimbursement for these items cannot be recommended.

The division concludes that the total allowable for this admission is \$13,416.00. The respondent issued payment in the amount of \$13,416.00. Based upon the documentation submitted no additional reimbursement can be recommended.

## **Conclusion**

The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this

dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under Division rules at 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307. The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

### **ORDER**

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is entitled to \$0.00 reimbursement for the services in dispute.

#### **Authorized Signature**

_____ Signature	_____ Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	_____ 12/13/2012 Date
--------------------	---	-----------------------------

_____ Signature	_____ Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Manager	_____ 12/13/2012 Date
--------------------	---	-----------------------------

### **YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL**

Either party to this medical fee dispute may appeal this decision by requesting a contested case hearing. A completed **Request for a Medical Contested Case Hearing** (form **DWC045A**) must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the Division. **Please include a copy of the *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision* together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §148.3(c), including a **certificate of service demonstrating that the request has been sent to the other party.****

**Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.**